REMARKS

Claims 60-79 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-59 are canceled. With this Amendment, no claims are added or canceled, and claims 60 and 70 are amended. Accordingly, claims 60-79 are at issue in the above-identified application.

I. 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 60-65, 68, 70-75, and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Richards* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,810). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Richards fails to teach every limitation of claim 60. For example, *Richards* fails to teach "determining whether cell data location information for a selected spreadsheet file cell is contained in a first grid record, *the first grid record storing a mapping between a plurality of spreadsheet file cells and the location of their corresponding cell data in a cell data record implemented in the record-based computer readable-medium*" (emphasis added). *Richards* fails to teach a first grid record that provides a mapping between the spreadsheet file cells and the location in a cell data record corresponding to those cells. See column 82, lines 1-20 of *Richards*. As far as *Richards* teaches, the cell data is located in the spreadsheet file cells themselves. See column 82, lines 1-20 of *Richards*. Furthermore, *Richards* fails to teach a cell data record implemented in a record-based computer-readable medium. See column 82, lines 1-20 of *Richards*. Moreover, the Examiner fails to establish that *Richards* teaches a cell data record that is distinguishable from what the Examiner regards as the first grid record. *Richards* merely teaches a spreadsheet, and fails to explain the constructs of how cell data from that spreadsheet is stored. See column 82, lines 1-20 of *Richards*.

Furthermore, *Richards* fails to teach "retrieving the cell data from the cell data record." *Richards* teaches that the cells are deleted. In contrast, claim 1 recites "retrieving the cell data." For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claims 60 and 70 are patentable over *Richards*. As claims 61-69 and 71-79 depend from claims 60 and 70 respectively, Applicants submit they are patentable as well for at least the same reasons.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 66, 67, 69, 76, 77, and 79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Richards* in view of *Horie et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,597, hereinafter "*Horie*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The rejection of claims 66, 67, 69, 76, 77, and 79 relies upon the assertion that *Richards* teaches every limitation of claims 60 and 70. As previously explained, that assertion is false. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

II CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2006 By: _____

A. Wesley Ferrebee
Registration No. 51,312

Customer No. 58328
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(202) 408-6832